

DTR-5238

Approved For Release 2002/05/31 : CIA-RDP78-06217A000200040037-1

SECRET

25X1A

*memo not signed
by DTR nor sent.
Att. forwarded to
[redacted] (o/PPB)
White
to show to DD/S.*

4 AUG 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Support

**SUBJECT : Board of Visitors Report on the
Defense Intelligence School and
the Information Science Center**

1. This memorandum is for your information. It raises issues that would also be of interest to Colonel White, Mr. Bross, and [redacted]

25X1A

2. A Board of Visitors, whose membership of eight included General Charles Cabell, Admiral Arley Burke, Dr. Edward Teller, and Mr. Lyman Kirkpatrick, Jr., wrote a severely critical report on the Defense Intelligence School and a supplemental report, equally critical, on the School's Information Science Center. (The later report parallels the critique submitted to the Director, Special Projects -- with copies to C/PPB and OTR -- by one of his employees who attended the pilot running of the Center's eight-week course, "Information Science in Support of Intelligence.") The Board's report, including the supplement, is attached. It was discretely given to me by [redacted] our liaison officer at DIS, who is expected to return it reasonably soon.

25X1A

3. Many deficiencies in DIS are cited. The faculty lacks academic qualifications and intelligence experience. Its members are untrained as instructors and they do not have appropriate security clearances. The lectures are overused; seminars are lead by unqualified people and there is too heavy a reliance on guest speakers.

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

Approved For Release 2002/05/31 : CIA-RDP78-06217A000200040037-1

SECRET

SECRET

The Information Science Center is faulted for its lack of clear, educational objectives and relevancy of its courses. (Two so far.) It is inadequately staffed (total of nine), too costly when balanced against returns (\$450,000, or 50% of DIS budget). It is not being supported by the intelligence community -- here publicity may be an answer -- and it "reflects credit neither on the DIS nor the intelligence system."

4. There are several recommendations which may have impact on CIA. One recommendation is to consider centralizing computer training at a single facility (presumed to be the Center); a second suggests increased interagency support in terms of instructional assistance, funds, and input to the student body. A third -- and this may very well be accepted -- recommends redirection of the Center's purpose: rather than continuing as a training facility, it may better serve in research and development of techniques and computer use.

5. Board members indicated willingness to serve as advisors throughout the year and invited progress reports from both the faculty and the administration.

HUGH T. CUNNINGHAM
Director of Training

Att

Distribution:

Orig & 2 - Adse, w/att
1 - DDS/Registry
2 - DTR
1 - EA/P

25X1A

OTR/HTC/[]:gap (4 August 1970)

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL

TO : DTR DDTR FOR INFORMATION AND APPROVAL OF SUGGESTED ROUTING

SUBJECT: Board of Visitors Report on the Defense Intelligence School and Its Subordinate Element, the Information Science Center (ISC)

1. This report does not give any high marks to DIS and the recently established Information Science Center. The Board is composed of eight distinguished citizens, including General C.P. Cabell, Admiral A.A. Burke, Mr. Lyman Kirkpatrick, and Dr. Edward Teller.
2. Some of the criticisms were: deficiency of faculty members in academic credentials (i.e. Ph.D.'s too few, for example), deficiency of intelligence experience among faculty members, faculty not properly trained for instructor assignments, over-use of guest lecturers, excessive use of lecture method, operation of seminars by unqualified faculty members. One of more interesting recommendations to improve apparent lack of support given to DIS by military services was the suggestion that DIS be given the "hard-sell" public relations treatment --briefings and seminars for consumers; luncheons with news media, members of Congress, and the military services.
3. As far as CIA is concerned, the recommendation that might imply some future involvement for the Agency is: CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN BY THE COMMUNITY TO MAXIMUM FEASIBLE CONCENTRATION OF THOSE COURSES SUSCEPTIBLE TO COMMON TREATMENT AT ONE JOINT SCHOOL WITH ACCOMPANYING INTEGRATION OF FACULTY AND RESOURCES. (page 9) In the light of the State Dept. Task Force Reports, which talk much about the encouragement of "...interagency integration, openness, and creativity within the Foreign Affairs Community...." and the recent survey made by the Bureau of the Budget of foreign language training programs within the Federal structure, it is worthwhile to note the trend of thought advocating greater centralization of training facilities and programs.
4. The Board also found some of the student complaints valid in regard to the 8-week ISC course, "Information Science in Support of Intelligence Functions." [redacted] of DDS&T/OSP prepared a very critical report on this course (COPY ATTACHED). Some of the complaints mentioned by the Board were: ISC mission not clearly defined and translated into easily understood instructional objectives, over-emphasis on pure mathematics and operations analysis, excessive use of guest speakers, subject matter not related to intelligence. The Board noted the lack of support to ISC by the Intelligence Community and expressed doubt that the majority of agencies really wanted or required ISC. THE BOARD RECOMMENDED THAT DIA ADVISE THE USIB THAT ISC WILL BE DISEBANDED UNLESS ADEQUATE ASSISTANCE IN TERMS OF MONEY AND PEOPLE ARE FORTH-COMING.

25X1A

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1

Approved For Release 2002/05/31 : CIA-RDP78-06217A000200040037-1

Approved For Release 2002/05/31 : CIA-RDP78-06217A000200040037-1